



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,315	03/10/2004	Daniel ManHung Wong	OR03-15501	1742
51067	7590	10/17/2006	EXAMINER	
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759			RAAB, CHRISTOPHER J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2169	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,315	WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher J. Raab	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

01. This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on August 07, 2006. **Claims 1-21** are pending in the present application. **This action is made FINAL**, as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

02. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

03. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

04. **Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10, 12 – 17, and 19 – 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP Alliance (Introduction to Validating User Input in Web Forms, December 29, 2003) in view of PBDR (SQL String Validation, June 24, 2003).

Consider **claim 1**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29). However, ASP Alliance does not specifically disclose that the signature is an SQL signature.

PBDR clearly shows that a query signature coded in ASP can be done through an SQL string (read as the signature is constructed from structured query language [SQL] keywords of the query) (page 1 lines 1 – 4, 33 – 34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the SQL string validation method taught by PBDR into the query string validation method taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing string validation procedures to work for multiple operating environments.

Consider **claim 2**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 3**, and **as applied to claim 2 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 5**, and **as applied to claim 2 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 6**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37) .

Consider **claim 7**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a method such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures generates a mismatch alert) (page 1 line 19) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid

query, the method further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1 line 16-17).

Consider **claim 8**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform a method for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29). However, ASP Alliance does not specifically disclose that the signature is an SQL signature.

PBDR clearly shows that a query signature coded in ASP can be done through an SQL string (read as the signature is constructed from structured query language [SQL] keywords of the query) (page 1 lines 1 – 4, 33 – 34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the SQL string validation computer-readable medium taught by PBDR into the query string validation computer-readable medium taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing string validation procedures to work for multiple operating environments.

Consider **claim 9**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 10**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 12**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 13**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by

control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37).

Consider **claim 14**, and **as applied to claim 8 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows a computer-readable storage medium such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures generates a mismatch alert) (page 1 line 29) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid query, the method further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1 lines 16-17).

Consider **claim 15**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus for using validation controls (read as query signatures to provide security for a database), comprising:

when the user's input is being processed (for example, when the form is submitted) (read as receiving the query at the database) (page 1 lines 20-21), the page framework passes the user's entry to the appropriate validation control or controls (read as parsing the query to determine a signature for the query, wherein the signature specifies a structure based on operations for the query and is independent of the value of literals in the query) (page 1 lines 21-22). The validation controls test the user's input and set a property to indicate whether the entry passed the test (read as determining if the signature is located in a signature cache, which contains signature for valid queries) (page 1 lines 22-23). And would test the state of the validation controls before updating a data record with information entered by the user. If you detect an invalid state, you bypass the update (read as if so, processing the query) (page 1 lines 27-29). However, ASP Alliance does not specifically disclose that the signature is an SQL signature.

PBDR clearly shows that a query signature coded in ASP can be done through an SQL string (read as the signature is constructed from structured query language [SQL] keywords of the query) (page 1 lines 1 – 4, 33 – 34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the SQL string validation apparatus taught by PBDR into the query string validation apparatus taught by ASP Alliance for the purpose of allowing string validation procedures to work for multiple operating environments.

Consider **claim 16**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail (read as if the signature is not in the signature cache) (page 1 line 29), you skip all your own processing (read as the method further comprises triggering a mismatch alert) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that validation controls that detected errors then produce an error message that appears on the page (read as the mismatch alert throws an error) (page 1 lines 30-31).

Consider **claim 19**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail, you skip all your own processing and the page is returned to the user (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a requesting applications, thereby allowing the requesting application to take action) (page 1 lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 20**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that when the user submits a form to the server, the validation

controls are invoked to review the user's input, control by control (read as the signature cache is initialized by recording signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization operation) (page 2 lines 36-37) .

Consider **claim 21**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, ASP Alliance clearly shows an apparatus such that if any validation checks fail (read as the signatures generates a mismatch alert) you enable validation of user input by adding validation controls to your form as you would other server controls (read as if the query is a valid query, the method further comprises allowing a database administrator to add the signature to the signature cache) (page 1, lines 29, 16-17).

05. **Claims 4, 11, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP Alliance (Introduction to Validating User Input in Web Forms, December 29, 2003) in view of PBDR (SQL String Validation, June 24, 2003) in further view of The PHP Group (Error Handling and Logging Functions, November 27, 2003).

Consider **claim 4**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed) (page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP

Group into the method of using query signatures taught by ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as applied to claim 8** above, ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed) (page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP Group into the use of query signatures taught by ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 15** above, ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, clearly show the claimed invention except for that a mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator.

The PHP Group clearly shows an example of using the error handling capabilities to define an error handling function, which logs the information into a file and e-mails the developer in case a critical error in logic happens (read as the mismatch alert is sent to a database administrator and the query is processed) (page 7 lines 5-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the error handling capability taught by The PHP Group into the use of query signatures taught by ASP Alliance, as modified by PBDR, for the purpose of allowing an administrator to monitor errors being entered into the database.

Response to Arguments

06. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

07. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

08. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

09. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Christopher Raab whose telephone number is (571) 270-1090. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Christopher Raab
C.R./cr



October 12, 2006



CHRISTIAN CHACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100